

Response to Comment Letter I27

Ken Von Wiley  
February 7, 2014

Comment Letter I27

**SOITEC SOLAR DEVELOPMENT  
PROGRAM ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

3800 12-010 (GPA); Tierra Del Sol, 3300 12-010 (MUP); 3600 12-005 (REZ),  
3824 77-046-01 (AP); Rugged Solar, 3300 12-007 (MUP); LanWest 3300 12-002  
(MUP); ENVIRONMENTAL LOG NO.: 3910 120005 (ER)

**NOTICE OF PREPARATION PUBLIC REVIEW PERIOD**  
December 6, 2012 through January 7, 2013

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING COMMENT SHEET

RECEIVED

FEB 07 2014

Planning and  
Development Services

Tuesday, December 18, 2012  
COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO  
DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES  
5510 OVERLAND AVENUE, SUITE 110  
SAN DIEGO, CA 92123

**WRITTEN COMMENT FORM**

*Please see continuation on next page (Page #12)*

*Per Comment #*

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

(Attach additional pages as needed)

**MAIL, FAX or E-MAIL FORMS TO:**

Robert Hingtgen  
County of San Diego  
Department of Planning & Development Services  
5510 Overland Avenue, Suite 110  
San Diego, CA 92123  
FAX #: (619) 694-3373  
E-mail: robert.hingtgen@edcounty.ca.gov

*[Signature]*

Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date *2-7-14*

*Ken Von Wiley*

Print Name \_\_\_\_\_

*39775 Jowet Valley Way*

Address \_\_\_\_\_

*Boylewood CA 91905*

City \_\_\_\_\_ State \_\_\_\_\_ Zip Code \_\_\_\_\_

*619-403-4119*

Phone Number \_\_\_\_\_

COMMENTS MUST BE RECEIVED BY 4:00 PM, JANUARY 7, 2013



	<p>PDF-AQ-1 is included as a condition of approval to minimize fugitive dust during construction activities and comply with County Code Section 87.428. This condition requires (1) the application of water to suppress fugitive dust during construction activities, (2) the maintenance of dust and debris at public street access points, (3) the stabilization of internal roadways with paving, the treatment of stockpiles, (4) traffic speed limitations, (5) material load limitations, and (6) the application a binding agent to disturbed areas. In response to fugitive dust following completion of construction activities, implementation of dust control measures, including the annual application of a nontoxic soil stabilizer or other acceptable methods, is also a condition of approval and would further reduce fugitive dust emissions during operations.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure M-BI-PP-5, as described in Section 2.3.6.1 of the DPEIR, requires the development of a project-specific fugitive dust control plan.</p> <p><b>I27-3</b> This comment raises concerns regarding property values. Property values are not an environmental issue and as such, are not evaluated in the Draft Program Environmental Impact Report (DPEIR).The information in this comment will be included in the FPEIR for review and consideration by the decision makers.</p> <p><b>I27-4</b> Issues raised in this comment related to potential adverse impacts to scenic views were considered and</p>
--	--

		<p>addressed in the DPEIR; see Chapter 2.1, Aesthetics. The County acknowledges that the Proposed Project would have certain significant and unavoidable impacts related to scenic vistas and visual character and quality. Also see response to comment I17-5.</p>
	<b>I27-5</b>	<p>Issues raised in this comment related to potential adverse impacts of wildfire hazards and fire response capabilities were considered and addressed in the DPEIR; see Chapter 3.1.4, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, and 3.1.7, Public Services. Please refer to the response to comment C3-4.</p>
	<b>I27-6</b>	<p>Please refer to common response WR1 and WR2.</p>
	<b>I27-7</b>	<p>Potential impacts related to traffic and road hazards resulting from the Proposed Project were considered and addressed in the DPEIR; see Chapter 3.1.8, Transportation and Traffic. Project design features, such as a traffic control plan and notification of residents would ensure that the Proposed Project would not create local driving hazards (see PDF-TR-1). The County found that the Proposed Project would have less than significant impacts related to traffic. This comment also raises concerns regarding damage to deteriorated roadways; see common response TR1.</p>
	<b>I27-8</b>	<p>Impacts to visual resources, including the addition of project lighting to the existing environment and potential effects to dark skies, were discussed in</p>

	<p>Chapter 2.1, Aesthetics, of the DPEIR. Please refer to Section 2.1.3.3, Light and Glare. In addition, as provided in Chapter 1.0, Project Description, Location, and Environmental Setting, lighting would be fully shielded and directed downward to minimize effects to surrounding properties. Section 5.1 of the County of San Diego <i>Guidelines for Determining Significance: Dark Skies and Glare</i> states that “a fully shielded outdoor light ensures that light rays emitted from the fixture are projected below the horizontal plane passing through the lowest point on the fixture from which the light is emitted” (County of San Diego 2009). As such, use of full shielding on solar farm lighting would ensure that direct uplight is not emitted and that dark skies are protected. Please also refer to the response to comment O1-4.</p> <p><b>I27-9</b> Issues raised in this comment related to potential adverse impacts of vegetation clearing were considered and addressed in the DPEIR; see Chapter 2.3, Biological Resources. It has been determined that the Proposed Project would have a less than significant impact on biological resources with the implementation of mitigation.</p> <p><b>I27-10</b> The County of San Diego (County) acknowledges the comment. The information in this comment will be provided in the FPEIR for review and consideration by the decision makers.</p>
--	---

	<p><b>References</b></p> <p>14 CCR 15000–15387 and Appendices A–L. Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act, as amended.</p> <p>SDAPCD (San Diego Air Pollution Control District). 2009. Rules and Regulations. Regulation IV. Prohibitions. Rule 55. Fugitive Dust. Adopted June 24, 2009, Effective December 24, 2009.</p>
--	---